

Jul 26, 2018

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

GEOFFREY ROBERT LAWSON,  
SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAN PACHOLKE; ELDON VAIL;  
ISRAEL ROY GONZALES;  
BRANDON WELLS; MARTHA  
HAYES; TAMERA AVERY; LORI  
WONDERS; JOHN DOES 1-10;  
PAUL BARKER; BONNIE  
LONGINO; H. HERNANDEZ; LT. D.  
BUSS; LT. M. MARRY; CC2  
JORDAN; BERNARD WARNER;  
RACHEL SHOOK; TRACY  
STUENKEL,

Defendants.

No. 2:16-CV-00361-SMJ

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE  
ORDER AND IN CAMERA  
REVIEW**

Before the Court, without oral argument, is Plaintiff Motion for Protective Order and In Camera Review, ECF No. 60. Plaintiff filed with the Court three compact discs (CDs) that contain public disclosure information received directly from the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts, Kitsap County Superior Court, and Kitsap County Sheriff's Office, respectively. ECF No. 61. Plaintiff asserts that he received the CDs through the Airway Heights Corrections

1 Center mailroom and has been in possession of each CD for more than one year.  
2 Plaintiff further asserts that the CDs “are not broken in half and used as shanks”;  
3 “do not contain any erroneous duplication of any of the Agency’s logo’s”; and do  
4 not “contain any form of malicious computer code that would threaten Defendants’  
5 or any other computer network.” ECF No. 60 at 3. Plaintiff argues that the CDs  
6 show Defendants’ arguments are meritless.

7 Plaintiff requests (1) in camera review of the documents; (2) a protective  
8 order forbidding Defendants from confiscating or viewing the information  
9 contained on the CDs unless necessary to dispose of the case; and (3) return of the  
10 original packaging, accompanying documents and CDs under the Court’s authority.  
11 Plaintiff’s motion is denied.

12 First, in camera review is not appropriate in this case. Generally, all  
13 documents provided to the Court must also be provided to all other parties to the  
14 case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 5. However, in limited cases, such as when one party  
15 asserts a claim of privilege, it may be appropriate for the Court to review documents  
16 in camera to determine whether privilege applies. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26. Plaintiff  
17 makes no assertion of privilege and advances no other reason why in camera review  
18 is necessary in this case.

19 Second, to the extent Plaintiff asks the Court to prohibit Defendants from  
20 confiscating the CDs, his request is duplicative of his motion for preliminary

1 injunctive relief. For the reasons outlined in the Court's previous order denying  
2 preliminary injunctive relief, such relief is not warranted.


3 Finally, although documents filed with the Court generally are not returned,  
4 the Court will direct the Clerk's Office to return Plaintiff's CDs at the conclusion  
5 of this case via standard legal mail procedures.

6 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

7 **1.** Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order and In Camera Review, **ECF**  
8 **No. 60**, is **DENIED**.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this Order and  
10 provide copies to all counsel.

11 **DATED** this 26th day of July 2018.

12   
13 SALVADOR MENDEZ A, JR.  
14 United States District Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20